

THE CITY OF ROCKVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

ROCKVILLE'S PIKE PLAN

Meeting 10-2013

T R A N S C R I P T

O F

P R O C E E D I N G S

ROCKVILLE CITY HALL

Rockville, Maryland

May 22, 2013

BEFORE:

JERRY CALLISTEIN, Chairman

DON HADLEY, Commissioner

KATE OSTELL, Commissioner

DAVID HILL, Commissioner

DION TRAHAN, Commissioner

JACK LEIDERMAN, Commissioner

JOHN TYNER, Commissioner

Deposition Services, Inc.

12321 Middlebrook Road, Suite 210

Germantown, MD 20874

Tel: (301) 881-3344 Fax: (301) 881-3338

info@DepositionServices.com www.DepositionServices.com



ORIGINAL

STAFF PRESENT

Andrew Gunning

David Levy

Clark Larson

C O N T E N T S

<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Barbara Sears	3
Nadia Azumi	8
Jacques Gelin	11
Kevin Zaletsky	15
Kate Savage	18
Roline Milfort	19
Richard Yarrow	21
Karl Harger	24
Brian Barkley	27
David Winstead	30
Jason Goldblatt	34
Robin Corridon	37
Dennis Cain	38
Patricia Woodward	41
Fei Wang	42
Sam Shipkovitz	45
Vicki McMullen	47
Marlene Berg	49
Mary Ann Barnes	50
Jim Farrelly	54
Jim Coyle	56
Stewart Bowman	58
Christina Ginsburg	61
Judy Miller	66

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to make sure everyone has
3 seen the ground rules for the hearings for tonight. This is
4 what we're following to make sure that everyone gets a fair
5 shake at speaking and being heard. We want to be as fair as
6 we can to everyone. Please understand that individuals
7 speaking as individuals get three minutes to speak. Members
8 of recognized organizations, like HOAs and PTAs and such, get
9 five minutes. When your time is up, your time is up. So
10 please, when you see the red light come on, finish up your
11 statement, finish up your thought quickly. We'll give you a
12 few seconds to wrap up. But then, we will ask you to stop if
13 you do keep going. We want to give everyone a chance to be
14 heard.

15 So without further ado, we will begin the hearings. We
16 have people who have signed up before this evening. People
17 have signed up this evening. And then after that we will
18 hear anyone else who hasn't signed up who wishes to be heard.
19 First on our list for public testimony on Rockville's Pike
20 Plan is Barbara Sears. And I'm going to ask this of
21 everyone. When you come up, please state your name and
22 address for the record so we remember who spoke. Thank you.

23 MS. SEARS: Yes. I have some written comments to
24 pass out.

25 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

1 MS. SEARS: Good evening. My name is Barbara
2 Sears, and I'm speaking tonight on behalf of Woodmont Country
3 Club. I'll try to summarize some of these statements. I
4 have them in writing. But first of all, I want to thank the
5 Planning Commission for it's long efforts in all of this.
6 And I think your revised plan has gone a long way to
7 addressing several of our issues. As we've said in the past,
8 and we want to point out tonight, the club has no immediate
9 plans to redevelop any of its property. And they're
10 undergoing right now a \$20 million interior clubhouse
11 renovation. It's fully, fully funded, and it's on its way.
12 And we support the mixed use zoning for the Woodmont frontage
13 that's part of the, part of the property. And we also
14 support the 600 -- 1,600 foot total perimeter lot and block
15 sizes that are recommended. And although we don't support
16 East Jefferson going through the property, we do, we are
17 satisfied now with the location, the proposed mid-pike east-
18 west streets that the plan shows.

19 We have two issues, and first we believe the -- of
20 concern. And first we believe the language at Page 436 of
21 the revised plan with the recommendation for the creation of
22 a regional park in the context of any development that may be
23 proposed in the future on the Woodmont Country Club property
24 should be removed or revised to make it clear that the need
25 for any kind of larger park would only be considered if the

1 club would cease to, its operations and develop the larger
2 park area outside the boundaries. I think that is the
3 context in which that comment came up at one point in the, in
4 the proceedings. But the size, scope, and scale of the
5 club's property within the plan boundaries is not appropriate
6 for a large park such as this recommendation seems to allude
7 to.

8 Additionally, our evaluation, and we'll submit
9 further information on this, shows that there are
10 approximately 100 acres of parkland in 11 city-owned parks
11 within a mile of the mid-pike portion of the plan, and two
12 large regional parks. The revised plan also talks about its
13 recommendations being based on the Prose Plan (phonetic sp.).
14 And we have some information the documents where we believe
15 that any recommendations such as this would be inconsistent
16 with the Prose Plan and the types of green space or park area
17 that was being referred to are smaller blocks and greens that
18 would be achieved through the zoning of 15 percent of the
19 lots that redevelop and not a part of the large, a large park
20 such as, again, may be, may be gleaned from that language.
21 So accordingly, we request the regional park language be
22 deleted from the plan or made clear as to what, what it
23 really is referring to, and not the frontage.

24 Second, we ask the Planning Commission to add
25 language --

1 CHAIRMAN: Please wrap up.

2 MS. SEARS: -- that --

3 CHAIRMAN: Please wrap up. Yes.

4 MS. SEARS: Yeah, well, you can see it in here.

5 Just add some language about sensitivity to the club's

6 ongoing operation if East Jefferson is put through.

7 CHAIRMAN: Okay.

8 MS. SEARS: So those are the points that are more
9 clarified in here, and we'll submit some further material in
10 the, into the record. Thank you very much.

11 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

12 COMMISSIONER HILL: A quick question. Ms. Sears?

13 CHAIRMAN: Is it working?

14 COMMISSIONER HILL: No. I turned it on.

15 CHAIRMAN: Oh.

16 COMMISSIONER HILL: I just wondered, can you
17 quickly quantify for us what you consider a large park to be
18 as opposed to a small park?

19 MS. SEARS: Well, I know. That's a good question.
20 And I kind of had the same question for, for the writers of
21 the plan because it refers to only a regional park. And all
22 we have is a very small developable area, probably eight or
23 nine acres in that, in that frontage. So, it, it's quite
24 unclear as to what's being referred to. And given that it's
25 such a small area that we would be redeveloping, if in the

1 future it redeveloped within the plan, that there really
2 doesn't seem to be any connection between that development
3 that might occur if the frontage was severed and, and a park
4 of any size. Thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER HILL: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN: Okay. This still is working. Okay.
7 Video, are you getting the speakers on the microphone?

8 MR. GUNNING: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN: Yes? Okay, good. I just wanted to make
10 suer. All right. Next on our list are Brian Downie and
11 Heather Dlhopsky from Linowes and Blocher.

12 MS. DLHOPOLSKY: Good evening. Actually, I just
13 have a quick procedural question. When I had it on call to
14 sign up to testify, I didn't differentiate plan versus zone.
15 So I think more of our comments are actually on the zone
16 versus the plan, but we were put in this group. So, should
17 we --

18 CHAIRMAN: Okay. I mean, you might be better,
19 then, waiting until the zoning to speak later.

20 MS. DLHOPOLSKY: Whichever is best for you.

21 CHAIRMAN: It will probably make more sense then.

22 MS. DLHOPOLSKY: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN: All right. Well, that was quick. Next,
24 David Winstead. I know he was having trouble getting here on
25 time, but I thought I'd give him the shot. Okay. We'll get

1 to him later. Nadia Azumi, please.

2 MS. AZUMI: Good evening.

3 CHAIRMAN: Good evening. And please state your
4 name and address for the record.

5 MS. AZUMI: For the record, my name is Nadia Azumi.
6 I'm a resident at 6 Nocturne Court in Rockville. I'm the
7 Vice President of Rose Hill Falls, and a West End Citizen
8 Association block captain. I would like to explain this in
9 bullet points because I know we have a very short time.

10 CHAIRMAN: And as a --

11 MS. AZUMI: So I will come to the point.

12 CHAIRMAN: As an organization, she gets five
13 minutes.

14 MR. GUNNING: (Indiscernible).

15 CHAIRMAN: WECA.

16 MR. GUNNING: Is that -- okay.

17 MS. AZUMI: Rose Hill. But I don't speak for WECA.

18 CHAIRMAN: Oh, you don't?

19 MS. AZUMI: No, I don't.

20 CHAIRMAN: You speak for Rose Hill?

21 MS. AZUMI: Not even for Rose Hill.

22 CHAIRMAN: Oh, just for yourself. Okay.

23 MS. AZUMI: Just for myself.

24 CHAIRMAN: Okay. I'm sorry. Then --

25 MS. AZUMI: If you want to give me five more

1 minutes, that's fine.

2 CHAIRMAN: No. No, in that case we'll have to go
3 with the three, so.

4 MS. AZUMI: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN: Please.

6 MS. AZUMI: I am here this evening to present to
7 the Planning Commission some of our concerns. And I would
8 put them in bullet points so that we can make it short. Was
9 there any visibility studies done in regard to this project?
10 And if so, was the residents and the West End members
11 approached to be part of it? The second point, bullet point,
12 if yes, we would like to have a copy of this document if you
13 so happen to have one. We will appreciate that very much.
14 Has there been any technical assistance? And if that is the
15 case, by whom and when? The fourth bullet point is the
16 engineers. The engineers are from St. Louis, I understand.
17 So they really don't know our issues here. So they come,
18 they do the project, and they leave. They don't know our
19 problems in Rockville. And that should be a concern to our
20 citizens as well. Who are the consultants in this project?
21 And if you do happen to know, I am sure you do. Maybe we can
22 talk with them and share with them, and they can share with
23 us their point of views as well. Who pays for the extension?
24 Is it us residents? And if it is so, can we be heard,
25 really?

1 There are a lot of problems that we, that I have
2 seen, that my neighbors have seen, that the West End has
3 seen. Eleven-story buildings, too high. No sun. Too many
4 people. Pollution, health hazard. Infrastructure,
5 destruction of the actual roads to rebuild. The traffic. If
6 there is an emergency and the Rockville Pike is closed, where
7 do we deviate the traffic? If you have a mother with two
8 children crossing the street with bags and shopping bags, how
9 can they cross? The parking issue. The police will be
10 overloaded with all these issues. The school will be
11 overloaded. The subway system is not that active anymore,
12 and with so many people coming in, how are we going to be
13 able to manage all that? Hospitals, in case of emergency,
14 how will they handle all the doctors? Subway I already said.
15 And in case of emergency, the Pike is the most important
16 venue for us to commute. Where shall we go? And what will
17 happen to the small businesses that are there? And they will
18 die, and they will lose the business. And to restart as you
19 know with the, with the, the situation, it will, it's not
20 very easy to find jobs and to help, you know, these poor
21 businesses.

22 So, I think there should be something very open to
23 all of us to, not to close each other but expand our views
24 and our point with, with the West End as well as Rose Hill
25 Falls and all the community here. I thank you for your time.

1 And I'm sorry. I'm going as fast as I can. I'm two seconds
2 over. Two seconds.

3 CHAIRMAN: You did great.

4 MS. AZUMI: Thank you very much for your time.

5 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

6 MS. AZUMI: Good evening.

7 CHAIRMAN: Thank you for speaking. Next on our
8 list is Jacques Greylin. Please forgive me if I mispronounce
9 people's names.

10 MR. LEVY: Gelin. Gelin.

11 CHAIRMAN: Grellin?

12 MR. LEVY: Gelin.

13 CHAIRMAN: Gelin. Okay. Sorry.

14 MR. GELIN: It's a rough beginning. Actually, my
15 family isn't sure how we pronounce it. It's with a hard G,
16 with some branches a soft G, different accents. So you can't
17 mispronounce my name.

18 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Because there's an R in there,
19 but.

20 MR. GELIN: I'm Jacques Gelin. I live at 105 South
21 Van Buren Street. I'm corresponding secretary for WECA, and
22 I appear for that organization. On April 18 of this year,
23 the Executive Board voted unanimously to support our
24 resolution, which is attached to my presentation, which is
25 opposed to the plan and to the rezoning. If time doesn't

1 permit, Noreen Bryan, our president, will take care of the
2 rest. Regardless of whether you call this a transportation
3 plan or a Rockville Development Plan, we think that the
4 result is the same. We'll have greater density, more
5 commercial development, and the result for the city will be
6 we'll lose our small town atmosphere, more city atmosphere,
7 that we've always treasured and that makes Rockville unique.
8 It doesn't serve the interest either of the West End or of
9 the city as a whole.

10 As a transportation plan, it will not do the job
11 because 355 is a major commuter road. We can't avoid that.
12 And Metro, which is already at capacity, there is no
13 alternative there to expand it. During rush hour, the cars
14 are already full by the time they get to Rockville. The plan
15 can't achieve two things; improve 355 and also serve the
16 interests of the city as a whole. It's either, it's an
17 incompatible project.

18 Now, as for the grand boulevard idea that's going
19 on with the six iconic boulevards, the short answer to that
20 is none of those iconic boulevards is a commuter highway, but
21 Rockville Pike is. Can't avoid that. And the fact that
22 you've got the bus, two lanes and plus six more lanes of
23 traffic, plus additional auxiliary lanes, Rockville's aging
24 population will not be able to cross that. And it will, it
25 will block any, any really friendly atmosphere that we have

1 in Rockville.

2 The plain fact that we already have failing
3 intersections, and they're going to get worse with this. The
4 net effect, the plan is asking you to degrade the problems we
5 already have. Under the plan, the population of Rockville,
6 if they are carried out, could double. And the city would
7 lose, again, its small town atmosphere. This two-mile
8 stretch of the pike has not been prepared with the residents'
9 interests. It fulfills the developers' ideas, and it
10 probably feels its ideas are what's good. But we didn't
11 create it. And that's the problem here. It's a massive
12 place. The APFO would be gutted or severely ruined. And
13 again, the attributes for Rockville, small town, adequate
14 schools, good roads, would be gutted. It's the best dream
15 for, for the developers, yes.

16 Now, the plan admits, and I'm quoting, it's likely
17 that the APFO is likely to inhibit continued redevelopment of
18 the Pike if the necessary infrastructure is not provided or
19 stand as revised. This is a bureaucratic way of saying that
20 we've got to either eviscerate the APFO or gut it. Again, we
21 would lose the precious qualities of Rockville, and our, and
22 our future shouldn't be, as I wrote, only from Frederick
23 through the large Gaithersburg, past Rockville, past Science
24 City, and all the way down to White Flint and the District
25 line. And we're, and at White Flint they're going to already

1 have huge 300-foot skyscrapers.

2 Now, we don't want to become another Bethesda. We
3 don't want to become White Flint, Rosslyn or anything like
4 that. Our schools are already crowded. By changing the
5 standards isn't going to make our education better. The APFO
6 is the basic tool to control growth, which I'm not against,
7 and we're not against. We've just have to control it
8 intelligently.

9 And finally, the Pike Plan endangers the \$51.7
10 million we spent as a city for the infrastructure for the
11 Town Center. They would be distracted, and, and the
12 businesses and all, the residents that we built there with
13 parking and all that would be lost if we had to invest in the
14 Pike. And we don't know how much the Pike would cost. The
15 police and fire protection that is added, we don't know the
16 amount of pollution that will result from the unfettered
17 development. There has been no cost benefit analysis. This
18 the staff admitted when they came to us. Now, I'm frankly
19 astonished by that.

20 In short, our precious lifestyle is endangered, and
21 we ask you to reject the plan and the line rezoning. Thank
22 you very much.

23 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay. Next on the list is
24 Noreen Bryan.

25 MS. BRYAN: I was only on the list in case that

1 testimony could not be completed in time. I will be
2 testifying on the Zoning.

3 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. Very, very
4 tricky. Okay. Next, Kevin Zaletsky.

5 MR. ZALETSKY: Good evening.

6 CHAIRMAN: Good evening. Again, your name and
7 address for the record, please.

8 MR. ZALETSKY: My name is Kevin Zaletsky. I live
9 at 101 North Street. I appreciate the opportunity to talk to
10 you guys tonight about the Rockville Pike Plan. I have been,
11 I continue to be in favor of a unified plan for Rockville
12 Pike. I think that my hopes are consistent with the hopes of
13 most of the residents of Rockville. I'd like to see a less
14 congested, more architecturally stunning, greener
15 thoroughfare that not only maintains the unique character,
16 but also the utility that the current Pike has. It also
17 makes Rockville a great place to live, to visit, and to do
18 business. Not only for customers, but also for small
19 businesses along the Pike.

20 I think that this current revision of the Pike Plan
21 offers, you know, a lot of positive ideas for achieving some
22 of these hopes. But I fear that we run the risk of
23 jeopardizing many or all of the hopes by trying to
24 accommodate artificial demands for, for density. I'm deeply
25 concerned, like Mr. Gelin, about the burden the added

1 population, you know, the eight to 13 story buildings up and
2 down the Pike, would add to our over-burdened schools and
3 badly-congested roads. To me, any time a proposal requires,
4 you know, changing our school standards or, you know, as that
5 we ignore critical lane volume failures at intersections in
6 order for it to be implemented, you know, I hope that it
7 would be a red flag to a commission like yourselves. These
8 school and traffic guidelines are minimum standards that, you
9 know, we set as a community, and we determine are vital to
10 the basic quality of life of our city. And if we have to
11 sacrifice those standards in order to enact the plan, we
12 should think twice about what we're going to do and whether
13 ultimately it's beneficial to the welfare of the citizens of
14 Rockville.

15 A lot like Mr. Gelin as well, when I think about
16 density I'm also a little bit confused by the Pike Plan as it
17 relates to our Town Square. My understanding has always been
18 of an urban center like the Town Square, that it's meant to
19 serve as the concentration of density and the center of
20 activity, you know, in a town. The City of Rockville, and
21 also by extension the tax payers, have invested millions of
22 dollars into the Town Square to make it a viable and thriving
23 destination. And I don't see how advocating construction of
24 buildings more than double the height of the square for
25 miles, you know, along a corridor outside its perimeter,

1 respects that concept.

2 In essence, are we not really proposing that the
3 Town Square would become the least dense area along Rockville
4 Pike for many miles? You know, and in doing so, are we not
5 also in essence proposing that Rockville taxpayers shell out
6 more tax dollars to fund the infrastructure to eventually
7 put, you know, our venture, the Rockville Town Square, out of
8 business?

9 Finally, I'd like to say that I know other areas
10 like White Flint have chosen to become large urban centers to
11 distinguish themselves from nondescript locations along the
12 Pike. But Rockville is not White Flint. It's a historic
13 town. It's the county seat. It has a rich history dating
14 back to the 1700s. There's Owens Ordinary, George Washington
15 marched through, our citizens protested British oppression in
16 Hungerford's Tavern during the Revolutionary War. We have
17 rich Civil War history. Every time I'm in a small town like
18 Frederick or Old Town, I wonder, you know, what could our
19 city have been like if we hadn't bulldozed the old town
20 center, which I'm sure city planners, you know, agreed for as
21 well.

22 My simple point, I'm running out of time here, is
23 just that, you know, if we choose to go higher, more urban,
24 more dense like Rosslyn, Crystal City, and Arlington, we're
25 never going to be able to go back. So think about those

1 cities. Think what those cities, think about what it brings
2 to your mind, and ask yourself if that's what you want
3 Rockville to be. I appreciate your time. Thank you very
4 much.

5 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay, next we have Kate
6 Savage from Park and Rec Board. Oh, handouts. Okay, five
7 minutes, please.

8 MS. SAVAGE: Yes. Good evening. I am Kate Savage.
9 I am Chair of the Recreation and Parks Advisory Board.

10 MS. MILFORT: I'm Roline Milfort. I'm a member of
11 the Recreation and Park Advisory Board.

12 MS. SAVAGE: The Recreation and Parks Board has
13 reviewed the revised draft of Rockville's Pike Plan, and they
14 are in support of the plan overall. We applaud the city's
15 ambitious goals to make Rockville an even more livable and
16 desirable environment. But while we're in support of this
17 plan, there's a lot of key factors that our support is
18 contingent upon. We believe that other city residents share
19 some similar hopes we have for this plan.

20 In regards to parks and open space, as stated in
21 the plan, there is currently no parks in the plan area. The
22 recent proclamation by the City's Mayor and Council during
23 the May 18th meeting of Kids to Parks Day strongly emphasize
24 the necessity and research-supported benefits of outdoor play
25 for children. These benefits include both health and school

1 performance benefits, such as less depression, less
2 hyperactivity, increased creativity, increased Vitamin D
3 levels, and reduction in childhood obesity and diabetes. We
4 need to be outside. We need opportunities to do it.

5 The City must be committed to make provisions for
6 its own publicly-declared ideals by ensuring that the parks
7 and open space are readily available to the residents.
8 Furthermore, these spaces must be usable space for play and
9 activity with a minimum of a third of an acre. While open
10 spaces such as wide medians make the area more inviting, they
11 should be supplemental, and not a substitute for parkland. A
12 core principle of the Department of Recreation and Parks is
13 that there should be a park within a 10-minute walk from
14 every resident's home. Individuals and families base their
15 decision to move to Rockville in part because of the types,
16 these types of ideals for our city.

17 Along these lines, the plan calls for a minimum of
18 10 acres of new parkland in the planned area. Plan area,
19 excuse me. Recognizing that this is the intent for the plan
20 area, the Board respectfully requests that the City considers
21 this as one of the mandatory, non-flexible, non-negotiable
22 components of the plan. We believe without this component
23 the long term success in support of the plan will greatly be
24 compromised.

25 MS. MILFORT: The fee in lieu alternative to public

1 use space is a creative option that can provide the city with
2 funds to develop parkland. When the city determines that a
3 developer will contribute fee in lieu to public space, the
4 City should safeguard these funds in a dedicated parkland
5 acquisition fund to ensure that they are used for the
6 appropriate purpose. Finally, to fulfill this commitment to
7 provide adequate parks in close proximity to all residents,
8 including potentially new residents, we encourage the city to
9 actively create parkland at the out -- at the onset and
10 ongoing as needed.

11 Also, we encourage the City to ensure the financial
12 viability to implement these ideals. We'd also like to speak
13 briefly on parking. The plan discusses sort of de-
14 emphasizing parking. And it cites several valid benefits to
15 this approach. Generally speaking, we are in agreement with
16 this approach, but we do have concerns about insufficient
17 parking. While residents will be encouraged to walk or bike
18 within the plan area, visitors from neighboring cities are
19 likely to drive. The proposed BRT transit system will
20 alleviate some of the need for parking. Nonetheless, we must
21 recognize that the use of personal vehicles will continue to
22 be the mode of transportation for the majority.

23 Visitors may be discouraged from traveling to
24 Rockville to shop, dine, or patronize businesses if there is
25 insufficient or expensive parking. The success of new

1 businesses will depend both on residents and neighboring
2 visitors. Thus, we request careful consideration is given to
3 both aspects of demands for parking.

4 MS. SAVAGE: Again, we want to thank the City for
5 its continuous efforts to make the City of Rockville a
6 desirable and great place to live, work, and play. And we're
7 hoping that the implementation of this plan will continue to
8 support the ideals and standards that we hold true in
9 Rockville, Maryland. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay. Let's see. We have
11 next Richie Yarrow, please.

12 MR. YARROW: Good evening, members of the City of
13 Rockville Planning Commission. My name is Richard Yarrow. I
14 am here to speak on behalf of the Richard Montgomery High
15 School Student Government Association. Five minutes? Thank
16 you. Which represents the roughly 2,100 students who come to
17 downtown Rockville each day for their education.

18 The Rockville Pike Master Plan calls for the
19 extension of Fleet Street through what is currently an
20 asphalt pathway connecting Fleet Street to Wootton Parkway
21 and the Ritchie Center. As many as 300 students, around 15
22 percent of Richard Montgomery's enrollment, use the pathway
23 along with the Fleet Street extension each weekday during
24 lunch to access the Ritchie Center and nearby shopping
25 establishments, with more students using the pathway after

1 school. Therefore, we urge you to consider the impact the
2 proposed extension may have on the everyday lives of
3 Rockville area youths. As pictures along with this testimony
4 will demonstrate, the Mount Vernon Place and Fleet Street
5 intersections are already fairly dangerous with cars almost
6 plowing into students who have the right of way. Since the
7 Fleet Street extension aims to reduce the traffic burden on
8 Wootton Parkway and Rockville Pike, we can probably assume
9 that congestion at the Mount Vernon Place and Fleet Street
10 intersection will increase after Fleet Street is extended, at
11 the same time adding another street crossing to students'
12 routes to the Ritchie Center. This will pose greater safety
13 risks to the large number of students who use the current
14 pathway.

15 Despite the possible relative merits of extending
16 Fleet Street, the Planning Commission has a responsibility to
17 help keep the City of Rockville safe for students. In lieu
18 of high auto dependence, it is crucial to encourage
19 pedestrians, and in particular the many young pedestrians who
20 have not yet found the need to use a car to travel only a
21 handful of blocks. The Richard Montgomery Student Government
22 believes that any extension of Fleet Street must hinge on
23 adequate safety plans, such as traffic lights or crossing
24 guards, and that RM students and community members should be
25 involved as much as possible when implementing such

1 precautions. Additionally, we request that construction be
2 planned to minimize the impact on pedestrians' ordinary
3 schedules so that students could still access the pathway
4 while the road is being built.

5 Once again, the students of RM urge you to consider
6 the impact of the proposed extension on our daily needs and
7 desire for safety. And thank you for this opportunity to
8 speak tonight.

9 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

10 COMMISSIONER LEIDERMAN: Could I ask a question?

11 MR. YARROW: Of course.

12 CHAIRMAN: Oh, they're working again.

13 COMMISSIONER LEIDERMAN: You were talking about the
14 problems if the road is put through.

15 MR. YARROW: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER LEIDERMAN: And then ways, if the road
17 is put through some ways to minimize the impact.

18 MR. YARROW: Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER LEIDERMAN: What is your preferred
20 position? That the road not go through, or that, or that the
21 road go through with modifications?

22 MR. YARROW: Well, first of all, I have to admit
23 that I don't live within the City of Rockville limits. So I
24 might not be the best to judge. From what I've seen of the
25 area by the, where the road would be constructed, it seems

1 that members of the community of that area do use that area
2 as a park fairly frequently. I believe that students could
3 use the area if the road was constructed as long as adequate
4 safety measures were implemented, and as long as there was a
5 wide enough sidewalk. But I'm not sure if many members of
6 the community in that area would agree with me.

7 COMMISSIONER LEIDERMAN: Thank you.

8 MR. YARROW: Thank you.

9 MR. LEVY: Thank you. Excuse me. I distributed
10 the photos to you. Do you have those photos electronically
11 so that we could -- if you could send them to me?

12 MR. YARROW: Sure.

13 MR. LEVY: I can distribute them to all the
14 members.

15 MR. YARROW: Sure.

16 MR. LEVY: If you, can I give you my card?

17 MR. YARROW: By all means.

18 MR. LEVY: Thank you. Very good.

19 CHAIRMAN: Does this mike work? Yeah, no. I've
20 got -- that's funny. Okay. Everyone's mike works but mine.
21 I wonder what they're trying to tell me.

22 COMMISSIONER HILL: Sorry, your time is up.

23 CHAIRMAN: Sorry, my time is up. Next on our list
24 we have Karl Harger. Welcome.

25 MR. HARGER: Good evening. I live at 1024 Paul

1 Drive. Just some quick notes as I read the document. It
2 appears to be fashioned to assist automobiles more than
3 anything else or making accommodations for cars as if the,
4 you know, the Lexuses and the BMWs would be slowed with their
5 credit-card-carrying customers to go to stores in Rockville.
6 I don't know whether that's a priority or intention of this
7 plan. I also scanned an entry here. These are sprinkling of
8 benefits here. We have green, the word green constantly. We
9 have moderately-priced dwelling units, and enticements if
10 developers are actually going to provide them. We have a lot
11 of great housing in Twinbrook. And the same entities that
12 are actually foreclosing on residents there and taking
13 ownership and holding onto homes that would otherwise be
14 available to families that need them are the same driving
15 forces behind this development.

16 So the biggest concern is, I emailed the City about
17 this, is how can we make sure that our democratic process
18 here is going to be preserved when we have Linowes and
19 Blocher over here. And they're not going to be objective or
20 without conflict of interests. So, I think there's some
21 great commentary here from this guy from Germantown about
22 light rail. D.C. now and Chinatown, they're going to be
23 running a train there. And if you are familiar with this
24 area, and Glen Echo and the trolley, an idea that was
25 ravished by a petroleum haze back in the days now seem to be

1 a more sensible way to transport people around.

2 I don't see this as being beneficial to my
3 neighborhood at all. I think, again, these streets are
4 simply to make sure that people aren't inconvenienced by
5 traffic. And I think we've had a long history with the
6 automobile in this country. A lot of variable history about
7 the use of petroleum. And perhaps as a progressive city as
8 ours, we should consider alternative methods of going around
9 and getting to stores.

10 I don't know what, what we're going to be building
11 here on some of these streets. Are we going to put another
12 Capital One Bank or an HSBC or one of these, these sort of
13 outlaw financial institutions that have, they still haven't
14 been brought to justice as they've hammered people in
15 Rockville particularly hard by, by predatory lending. And
16 these are the same people that after presumably these
17 families are either chased out of the city because they can't
18 live here, that will be able to come back to these same
19 entities and try to rent one of their shacks up on the third
20 floor.

21 So I don't see this as a, as a democratic process
22 at all. I wish more people would come up to the City of
23 Rockville and get involved. This is about our neighborhoods.
24 This is about our communities. And that's pretty much my
25 rant for tonight. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Thank you very much. Okay,
2 next we have Brian Barkley from Chamber of Commerce.

3 MR. LEVY: Mr. Chair, as Mr. Barkley is making his
4 way up front, you called David Winstead earlier. We knew he
5 would be running late, but he is here now as well. I just
6 wanted to let you know.

7 CHAIRMAN: Okay.

8 MR. LEVY: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN: Why don't -- Mr. Winstead, why don't you
10 go next then, please? Yes, after.

11 MR. BARKLEY: Thank you. I am Brian Barkley. I
12 reside currently at 513 Falcon Park Lane in King Farm. I
13 have also practiced law in Rockville at 51 Monroe Street for
14 over 30 years. I know a fair amount about the City of
15 Rockville. But I will tell you, as I told you the last time
16 I spoke before this group, which was the first time I ever
17 did, that although I am an attorney, I do not represent any
18 developers. I am, however, speaking this evening on behalf
19 of the Rockville Chamber of Commerce. And I have five points
20 I would like to make on behalf of the Chamber.

21 One. A strong business community is a critical
22 component of the quality of life enjoyed by everyone in
23 Rockville. The Pike Plan recognizes that Rockville Pike is a
24 critical component of that vibrant business community. We
25 need to make sure that existing property owners can make

1 modifications and expansions that will allow them a
2 reasonable rate of return on their investment. A recent
3 study commissioned by the Mayor and Council found that mixed
4 use development brings more tax revenue to the city than any
5 other form of development.

6 Two. We need to preserve Rockville as a regional
7 retail destination and retain the national chains, anchor
8 stores, speciality retailers, and local shops. We need to
9 continue to provide what retail needs for success,
10 visibility, accessibility, signage, customer traffic, and
11 parking. We need to state a clear transition plan that
12 allows existing retail centers to remain and proper while
13 under-utilized sites redevelop per the plan. We need to
14 encourage active retail at whatever location within the plan
15 the free market places it. Safe streets rely on activity at
16 the street level provided by retail.

17 Three. The plan needs to recognize that residents
18 and workers walk to and from the Twinbrook Metro Station from
19 businesses and residents west of Rockville Pike. Take
20 advantage of the proximity to the metro, and expand the
21 transit-oriented area and urban core to encompass a logical
22 area to the west of Rockville Pike in line with the station.
23 We should not waste the opportunity to create a walkable
24 neighborhood near the Metro station, just old neighborhoods
25 are not what we need. We're going to have changes in this

1 area. We need to create some new neighborhoods as well. The
2 transit node to extend to Jefferson Street since it is in
3 easy walking distance, and there also exists a step-down
4 buffer by virtue of the existing high-rise apartment
5 buildings along Jefferson.

6 Four. The plan needs to be coordinated with other
7 policies and issues inside the City and market forces outside
8 the City. The plan needs to be coordinated with the APFO in
9 light of the current state of school capacity and traffic
10 capacity along the Pike. But the City also needs flexibility
11 to allow more development in the areas where the APFS may not
12 adequately reflect actual school or road usage or potential
13 school or road usage.

14 Five. We need to create a vision and strategy for
15 the Pike. We need to define ourselves rather than sitting by
16 while others to our north and our south end up defining us.
17 The Chamber strongly recommends more input, information, and
18 ideas be solicited from stakeholders and experts. The
19 Chamber stands ready to assist in this process. Thank you
20 for your time.

21 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. All right. Now
22 Mr. Barkley. No. No, that was Mr. Barkley. I'm sorry.
23 Let's see. We had Karl -- oh, that was David Winstead.

24 MR. WINSTEAD: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.
25 Yes, thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN: Oh, thank you.

2 MR. WINSTEAD: Mr. Chair, members of the Planning
3 Commission, I'm pleased to be here. I'm David Winstead. I'm
4 an attorney with Ballard Spahr that has offices in Bethesda
5 and Washington, D.C. And I'm really ready to provide some
6 comments on behalf of the White Flint Partnership,
7 specifically on the transportation elements of the draft
8 Rockville Pike Plan. We have, the partnership has for a
9 number of years now been coordinating with the City of
10 Rockville, your fine Planning and Transportation Staff. And
11 I wanted to, just as a way of introduction, the partnership
12 is comprised of property owners, as many of you all know, in
13 the White Flint sector just south of the City of Rockville
14 along Maryland 355 South, some of which have property
15 interests within the City of Rockville.

16 As the partnerships and their members, individual
17 members continue to pursue development plans approved by the
18 White Flint Sector Plan, we have and will continue to
19 coordinate with the transportation-related issues that are
20 growing in terms of build-out of the White Flint Sector, and
21 obviously the vision for the Rockville Plan on the northern
22 part. I would mention that Francine Waters, who is the
23 executive director of the White Flint Partnership and works
24 with Lerner Enterprises recently served on the Montgomery
25 County Transit Task Force with some of your fine

1 Transportation Staff here in the City of Rockville. So they
2 had an opportunity to take a look at that debate about what,
3 what could be a way to provide some increased rapid transit
4 bus service in the county connecting obviously the CCT
5 through Rockville and down to the NIH and the Navy Medical
6 Campuses. And through that process, they made
7 recommendations, which I think some of you all are currently
8 aware of.

9 And as a way of background, I had the pleasure of
10 serving as Maryland Secretary of Transportation from '95 to
11 '98 and actually represented City of Rockville in Annapolis
12 for many years. So really very much enjoyed that and look
13 back at the build out of Rockville Town Center and the
14 success it's, it's been. I continue to work with the City,
15 Montgomery County, and the State of Maryland on
16 transportation infrastructure issues and economic
17 development-related issues.

18 The transportation elements set forth on Page ES-4,
19 the Executive Summary and elaborating thereafter, are
20 compatible with those that were approved as a part of the
21 White Flint Sector Plan in terms of the vision for 355. That
22 vision of a redesigned and reconstructed Rockville Pike as a
23 multi-way boulevard sets the stage I think for continuity
24 between transportation services up and down Rockville Pike,
25 Maryland 355, while meetings local community needs, which I

1 know is a big concern. We've heard earlier about really
2 focusing on local community needs in terms of transportation,
3 road network as well as pedestrian safety, access to transit,
4 Twinbrook and the like, as well as doing that within adequate
5 right of way conditions and safety.

6 The Partnership is very pleased to see the
7 inclusion of the, quote, high-capacity transit service in the
8 plan, with the center line median dedication along Rockville
9 Pike and the portion of Maryland 355 South. I think this
10 vision allows for community-serving transit options with
11 convenient access to stations along the way, as well as
12 bringing pedestrians and cyclists closer to land use and
13 retail options along the Pike, in addition to --

14 CHAIRMAN: Okay.

15 MR. WINSTEAD: -- accommodating obviously the vast
16 traffic that flows along Rockville Pike.

17 CHAIRMAN: All right. Your time is up, sir.

18 MR. WINSTEAD: All right. Just as a way of
19 closing, I would like to submit with my comments a copy of an
20 alignment study that the White Flint Partnership had
21 performed and completed a couple of years ago which
22 essentially pairs with your vision. And I would like --

23 CHAIRMAN: Okay.

24 MR. WINSTEAD: -- I hope you all consider this.
25 And again, we do support that center line alignment. This is

1 the plan. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN: Okay, thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER HILL: I do have a follow-up question.

4 CHAIRMAN: Your mike works, too.

5 COMMISSIONER HILL: Mr. Winstead?

6 MR. WINSTEAD: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER HILL: You like the center line
8 configuration for the Rockville part of the Pike, yet it is
9 not in the White Flint part of the Pike. Can you reconcile
10 those two?

11 MR. WINSTEAD: Well it is, it is in the Sector Plan
12 part and is reflected in the alignment study. So it is, it
13 is a part of the alignment study that, that we are studying
14 now, both the County DOT and State Highway are looking at
15 that, you know, basically a median line alignment, the
16 adequate setbacks that are required in maintaining the 11-
17 foot lanes of traffic along Rockville Pike.

18 COMMISSIONER HILL: Okay. So this is a follow-up
19 to what's actually committed in the White Flint Plan now,
20 which is curbside, breaking out buses to curbside services.

21 MR. WINSTEAD: No. The original sector plan, the
22 original sector plan, this is before essentially the Transit
23 Task Force came out with this Phase 1 recommendation. But
24 this, this alignment study which was done in anticipation of
25 that shows the median alignment along --

1 MR. LEVY: Just as a point of clarification. The
2 White Flint Sector Plan was approved with two alternate
3 potential cross-sections, one of which has the buses on the
4 outer lanes, and one of which has center line. And the White
5 Flint Sector Plan -- I can distribute the sheet to you, to
6 you afterwards -- gives two options. It doesn't choose in
7 the approved plan.

8 MR. WINSTEAD: Thank you.

9 COMMISSIONER HILL: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN: Mine still doesn't work. All right.
11 Next we have Jason Goldblatt, please.

12 MR. GOLDBLATT: Good evening. My name is Jason
13 Goldblatt, and I'm appearing on behalf of the Wilco
14 Construction Companies. Since 2010, we've been partners in
15 an entity which owns property at 12401 Twinbrook Parkway at
16 the intersection of Twinbrook Parkway and Chapman Avenue.
17 Our property is located at the far edge of the City's
18 municipal boundaries and the Pike Plan's South Pike area.
19 It's improved with the commercial building that is currently
20 leased to the Guitar Center. Together with our partners, we
21 control the entire block bounded by Twinbrook Parkway,
22 Chapman Avenue, and Bou Avenue. We wanted to thank the
23 Planning Commission Staff for their ongoing commitment to the
24 Pike Plan process and for helping to articulate a vision for
25 a new, transit-oriented community in the vicinity of the

1 Twinbrook Metro Station.

2 We've followed the Pike Plan with great interest
3 and believe that over time the plan will help the City
4 transform the existing development around this Metro station
5 into a true smart-growth neighborhood. We have analyzed our
6 property and it's potential for assemblage, and believe that
7 it will be possible to embrace the Pike Plan's concepts in
8 connection with the future redevelopment of our site. We are
9 concerned, however, that the Pike Plan and the draft code
10 overlook a very unique opportunity that exists at our site to
11 maximize the potential of smart growth redevelopment to serve
12 and promote transit.

13 While we are grateful that staff has recommended
14 base maximum heights of up to 11 stories for our property, we
15 do believe that the appropriateness of additional height at
16 this location has not been fully considered. If greater
17 building heights are appropriate anywhere in Rockville, this
18 is the location. Our block is uniquely situated at the
19 southernmost tip of the plan area. The block is bounded on
20 the north by Twinbrook Parkway, a wide arterial roadway, to
21 the east by the railroad and Metro tracks. In this segment,
22 the tracks do not abut any single-family residential
23 properties. While the primary justification for restricting
24 building heights is compatibility, limiting our properties to
25 11 stories would serve no such purpose. Here, greater

1 heights would actually be more compatible with existing and
2 planned development and would help create a better transition
3 between the County and the South Pike District. The Allex
4 (phonetic sp.) and Montrose Crossing Building located
5 directly across Bou Avenue to the south of our block is
6 constructed at a height of 19 stories. To the west of our,
7 across Chapman Avenue is the Pike Center, which will be
8 subject to the County's White Flint Sector Plan too. We
9 anticipate the County will ultimately approve ambitious
10 heights for the Pike Center, given the nearby Metro station.

11 The Pike Plan specifically notes that heights up to
12 300 feet are currently permitted in White Flint and suggest
13 that no more than half that height would be suitable for
14 Rockville in proximity to the Metro. We disagree with the
15 conclusion that compatible buildings heights would not be
16 suitable for this critical Metro station area and
17 respectfully ask the Planning Commission to consider allowing
18 heights for our block that would be consistent with those in
19 the adjacent White Flint area.

20 We are excited about the opportunity to contribute
21 to the vision for the South Pike District, but for all of
22 these reasons I have stated, we believe that our contribution
23 will be even greater with the opportunity to develop a larger
24 project. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you. Okay. Robin

1 Corridon.

2 MS. CORRIDON: My name is Robin Corridon. I'm a
3 resident of 433 Winding Rose Drive. Thank you for the
4 opportunity to share with you the reasons I oppose the
5 Rockville Pike Plan. This morning on NBC-TV, I heard an
6 anchor state that tonight a public hearing was going to take
7 place in Rockville about the Pike Plan that is to enhance the
8 beauty of the Pike. That was exactly what they said. If I
9 didn't know better, I would have thought the plan was about
10 adding flower pots in front of the buildings. Instead, it is
11 not a plan about making the Pike beautiful. It's a plan that
12 is not about the residents of Rockville and their wishes and
13 quality of life, but about what the city planners envision.

14 This is a plan that will make Rockville look like
15 Ballston and K Street. I for one do not want that
16 environment. I would live in a crowded city if that's what I
17 wanted. The qualities that attracted me to Rockville will be
18 gone. Our schools will be more overcrowded, and traffic will
19 be worse than it is now. I do not want to see high rise
20 buildings in my city. These will destroy the neighborhoods
21 that they abut. The plan threatens Rockville's quality of
22 life and character. A great deal of time was spent
23 developing the APFO. Now we can throw it away so that
24 developers can have a field day at our expense. When one of
25 the city planners addressed a meeting of the West End

1 Citizens Association to present the Pike Plan, he was asked
2 who would pay for the infrastructure and the additional
3 public services that would be required. He did not have an
4 answer. We were told that has not been addressed.

5 The City has already assumed considerable debt from
6 the Rockville Town Center, and residents for the most part do
7 not want or cannot afford to take on an ever-increasing
8 financial burden created by the City. In summary, the
9 massive population increase and proposed density, building
10 height, inadequate infrastructure, negative effect on the
11 environment, over-crowded schools, traffic, and negative
12 impact on small businesses do not point the way to smart
13 growth or a place I want to live. It's time for the City to
14 listen to the residents and not the city planners. Thank
15 you.

16 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. So we have Dennis
17 Cain.

18 MR. CAIN: Good evening. I'm Dennis Cain. I lived
19 at, have lived at 502 Carr Avenue for 45 years now. I
20 attended the public hearings on Rockville Pike a year or so
21 ago. And based on the very negative responses of the
22 community to the plan at that time, I was surprised to see
23 that it has arisen from the ashes as essentially the same
24 product. You have had ample testimony regarding the view of
25 the Rockville Pike Plan from the residential community, so I

1 will not repeat those comments.

2 I will instead focus on the differences in the
3 Montgomery County Adequate Public Facility Ordinance and that
4 of the City of Rockville. I would quote from the plan, the
5 APFO, this is from the Executive Summary. The APFO is likely
6 to inhibit the continued development of the Pike if the
7 necessary infrastructure is not provided or the standards are
8 not revised. So with that in mind, I will, I would state
9 that the development community in Rockville would dearly love
10 to see the City of Rockville weaken the standards applied by
11 the City to ensure that new developments in then City do not
12 overwhelm the Rockville infrastructure, especially in terms
13 of school enrollment and traffic capacity.

14 The present APFO in Rockville allows projected
15 school enrollment to exceed school capacity in one particular
16 school by 10 percent. After which a moratorium on
17 residential development in the school area is imposed until
18 additional school capacity becomes available. Some believe
19 that simply adjusting the constraint to allow projected
20 enrollment to exceed school capacity by 20 percent would
21 satisfy the county standards, and this is simply not the case
22 in a number of respects. I realize that you all are aware of
23 this from your study of the APFO, but many of your audience
24 and listeners are not.

25 First, the County requires that the projected

1 average enrollment of all of the schools at that level in a
2 cluster exceed the 120 percent before the moratorium is
3 considered. Enrollment in a particular school could be 150
4 percent of capacity as long as the adjacent schools allow the
5 average to be below 120 percent. This is fundamentally
6 different from the Rockville APFO which involves a single
7 school only.

8 Secondly, in the event that the cluster is
9 projected to be over-enrolled to the extent that a moratorium
10 on residential development is called for, MCPS employs the
11 option of placing a ghost school or classroom space in the
12 future budget plan so as to appear that the adequate
13 classroom space will be available and thus prevent the
14 imposition of development moratorium. Indeed, Mr. Chris
15 Beller (phonetic sp.) who is the planner at MCPS, has stated
16 at public forum that the MCPS recognizes that development is
17 a major economic engine in the county and makes every effort
18 to avoid interfering with it.

19 Thirdly, there is a mechanism in the books in the
20 County by which developers may purchase classroom space in
21 overcrowded schools to allow residential development to
22 proceed in a school cluster with a projected enrollment of
23 120, over -- of 105 to 120 percent.

24 CHAIRMAN: Please wrap up, sir.

25 MR. CAIN: I understand the payments -- I will

1 close shortly. Finally, the, this is -- my understanding
2 this has been deferred. Finally, the Planning Commission
3 formed a committee to study the APFO and make recommendations
4 to the Commission. That group met for six months, as you
5 know, and in spite of a barrage of input from the development
6 community, voted at the end of that time not to adopt the
7 county standard. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay. Next is, I believe,
9 Patricia Woodward.

10 MS. WOODWARD: Good evening.

11 CHAIRMAN: If you can adjust the mike to your mouth
12 so we can hear you.

13 MS. WOODWARD: I beg your pardon?

14 CHAIRMAN: Adjust the mike down a little. Yes. So
15 we can hear you.

16 MS. WOODWARD: Is that all right?

17 CHAIRMAN: Yes.

18 MS. WOODWARD: Okay. Good evening. My name is
19 Patricia Woodward. And I reside in the West End of the, of
20 this fair city at 111 North Van Buren Street here in
21 Rockville. Actually, we've lived there for 32 years. But I
22 have lived or worked or both in Rockville since 1964. A few
23 weeks ago, I observed neighborhood boys and girls playing.
24 And one was struggling with a toy. And he couldn't get it to
25 work. And he goes Houston, we have a problem. I immediately

1 was thinking about the Rockville Plan. And I immediately
2 said under my breath, yes young man, we do have a problem.

3 We don't want to become a Bethesda, or a North
4 Bethesda extension. We don't want to become a Rosslyn.
5 We're concerned about small businesses going away because
6 they won't be able to afford the high rent. We recognize
7 that the Rockville Pike now is an economic engine for the
8 city. And then they say that it's walkable, crossing
9 Rockville Pike from one side to the other, 10 lanes of cars
10 including transit buses, bicycles. Are you kidding me? Have
11 you been down the Pike lately and watched people try to get
12 across? No. We don't want to live in a crowded city
13 environment. We've said it many times. We enjoy Rockville
14 as Rockville. We enjoy that we do not live in an urban
15 setting.

16 The Plan was written without regard for the current
17 residents of Rockville or the neighborhoods on either side of
18 the Pike. Isn't that a wonderful word, neighborhood? So I
19 end with let Rockville be Rockville. We don't need to be
20 another anonymous concrete canyon on a Metro line with high-
21 rise apartments, national chain stores. I thank you for your
22 time.

23 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Okay. Next would
24 be Fei Wang.

25 MR. WANG: My name is Fei Wang. I live at 814 East

1 Jefferson Street. First, thank you for giving me the chance
2 to provide comments about this plan. I would like to provide
3 the comments about the Fleet Street extension and that cross-
4 section. It is on the plan and that's mentioned on Chapter 4
5 on Page 14. I draw the one, I print out the plan. That plan
6 mentioned about on the east side of that extension they will
7 have trees on the east side.

8 And what I recommend here is to put the few tree
9 buffer on the resident side. The reason is in case there is
10 an extension that is built, it will have increased traffic
11 and air pollution, and especially noise. And we also have a
12 lot of safety and privacy concern. Because now actually,
13 anyone -- I printed out this one too, picture. If you stand
14 on this restaurant side, you can see through my window. See
15 everything, you know, my clothes. If my, you know, family,
16 my kids play over there, you see everything. And the City
17 did, you know, last time I mentioned about, you know, this
18 concern, they did add the trees. But look at this tree.
19 Now, you can see blue sky. And just after one year, there is
20 no buffer at all. Every day, you know, what is the
21 restaurant making? Okay?

22 So, that's why I use, that's why I propose this
23 one. We have two trees on the resident side, which is added
24 buffer, you know, to the resident. And also reduce the, you
25 know, traffic noise, the impact. And also my, you know, I

1 think there's a sidewalk and on-street parking. By my
2 understanding, this extension is for, to provide the traffic
3 relief for 355. I don't see the reason that we, why we need
4 on-street parking. Because, you know, for this location,
5 that's very -- sorry. So many papers. I just want to show
6 you, on this side, the west, the east side. It's
7 restaurants. It's closed restaurants. No entrance at all.
8 So we don't see, you know, the reason. And if we want to
9 build a tree, we like to build a tree. And even, they can do
10 that street parking to another, like up the street, that
11 would be good.

12 Also, I recommend those kind of trees. You know,
13 that would be helpful. You know? So, okay. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. If you could send electronic
15 versions of those pictures --

16 MR. WANG: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN: -- that would be great.

18 MR. WANG: Yes. I have been using the City's GS,
19 software, I mean good maps, so.

20 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Yes, I just want to get the
21 pictures.

22 COMMISSIONER HILL: I have a question. Mr. Wang?
23 One of the things we've asked our city engineers to look at
24 is whether we can get a landscape berm into that area, as
25 well as, as a buffer element. Is that something that you

1 would be in favor of as an immediate neighbor?

2 MR. WANG: Absolutely. Yes, yes. Definitely.

3 COMMISSIONER HILL: Okay.

4 MR. WANG: And also I remembered there were
5 students mentioned. You know, their concern, I do believe
6 them because my mom now, I mean they sit in our back, count
7 how many students walk to that center. Before that, actually
8 before I bought this property, I saw all of those trees
9 behind my yard. It's beautiful. I printed them out too, but
10 I don't want to show here. But now my mom sees everything,
11 and counts students. They do have more than 100 students
12 every day walk through that. They have, I appreciate, you
13 know, the plan already mentions the speed control. That
14 would be very beneficial to students, so.

15 CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you very much. Okay,
16 next is Sam Shipkovitz, please.

17 MR. SHIPKOVITZ: Yes, sir. My name is Sam
18 Shipkovitz. And a lot of the people, the fellow in the black
19 t-shirt and a number of the people before me have essentially
20 said most of what I'll say in a written paper that I filed by
21 the deadline. To summarize my big-picture point of view, I
22 am not opposed to development. But this is excessive
23 development. The zip code that I was born has an equivalent
24 in D.C. to Bethesda, and they have a five-story limit for
25 anything. With that said, my primary opposition is to having

1 residential units that do not have adequate parking. That's
2 it in a nutshell. One developer wanted to put up 700 units,
3 and I don't remember the exact number, but it was less than
4 half of that in parking on-site. The insurance company with
5 the local developer is trying to put up a 14-story apartment
6 building and share the garage with an office building. And
7 the arguments here was over the aesthetics overlooking the
8 office building and neglected the realities that we are a
9 block away, single family neighborhood residence that Mr.
10 Tyner lives in. And I'll get to that in a second. We're,
11 there are excess cars. We don't even call it excess cars.
12 They're normally associated number of cars with those mix of
13 residential units will essentially be forced to put their
14 cars on our streets in the Twinbrook single-family
15 neighborhood, the Halpine and Holland and Lemay, Lewis areas.
16 That's my big picture.

17 Now, I was informed that a number of the members of
18 this Commission have had terms that have expired. I have
19 asked before. I ask again, the people whose terms have
20 expired, I believe there is nobody here from the City
21 Attorney's Office, is that correct? Well, I don't know what
22 the authority is or isn't. I have an opinion because I don't
23 know the law. But with that said, I do believe it's within
24 my right to ask whose terms have expired to have these
25 members identify themselves for the record. That's it in a

1 nutshell. By the end of the month, I will file a formal
2 paper. The guy in the black t-shirt, he reminds me of the
3 scene in Back to School where Rodney is getting up in front
4 of the teacher to explain the realities of business to a
5 business school.

6 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.

7 MR. SHIPKOVITZ: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay. Next is, I believe
9 that's Vicki McMullen. Vicki McMullen.

10 MR. LEVY: She's here.

11 CHAIRMAN: Oh there. There you are. Okay.

12 MS. MCMULLEN: I'm Vicki McMullen. I live at 100
13 North Street. Good evening. Thank you all for your really
14 hard work on this plan. I'm sure you're ready to complete
15 this really long task. That said, there's still some
16 revisions that I hope you would consider. I'm concerned that
17 the type of redevelopment envisioned in this plan might well
18 have the unintended effect of diminishing Rockville's
19 uniqueness, character, and diversity. Rockville shouldn't
20 just become another anonymous stop on the Metro line. We
21 don't want to lose our diversity and have it replaced by a
22 franchised, carbon-copy of every other new sterile, urban
23 environment. We shouldn't lose what makes Rockville
24 Rockville.

25 I'm also concerned that high rents could drive out

1 small businesses, as many others have expressed. Right now,
2 Rockville Pike is a major economic engine for the City. We
3 don't want to lose the goose that's laying the golden eggs.
4 Some say the plan will mean less traffic in Rockville. If
5 that's true, why does the plan suggest weakening the APFO
6 traffic standards? With Metro already overcrowded and bus
7 rapid transit unfunded and uncertain, more residents will
8 bring more traffic, not less traffic.

9 School overcrowding will worsen if the APFO is
10 weakened to implement this plan. We're told that children
11 don't live in apartments, but school buses full of children
12 disembark every afternoon at new apartments, apartment
13 developments.

14 Some say with Science City on one end and White
15 Flint on the other, Rockville will be left behind. They urge
16 us to rush headlong into our own massive, high-density
17 redevelopment to prevent this. But right now we enjoy a
18 great quality of life and a strong economy. And people want
19 to live here because of that. As the rest of the county
20 becomes increasingly unlivable, Rockville can be an oasis
21 where people can continue to enjoy a great quality of life,
22 but only if we reject this type of over-development. The
23 plan aims to change Rockville into a denser, urban
24 environment. But most people who live here don't want that.
25 The plan as written is too dense and is out of step with the

1 wishes and needs of our residents. The plan needs to be
2 scaled back. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Next, Marlene
4 Berg.

5 MS. BERG: Good evening. My name is Marlene Berg,
6 and I live at 715 Beall or Beall Avenue in Rockville and have
7 lived here for many, many years. And at the risk of sounding
8 like Mr. Rogers, the West End is my neighborhood. And I am a
9 member of WECA, although I am not representing WECA today.

10 First of all, I want to start out by saying that I
11 can see that a lot of work and effort and time and money has
12 gone into the plan for the Pike. But I would like to share
13 with you some of my thoughts and some of my concerns. If
14 I'm, if I were to be standing on the Pike now and either
15 looking down the Pike or up the Pike, and I'll be the first
16 to say that I frequent some of the, the strip malls and the
17 box stores along the Pike. But if I'm standing, looking down
18 the Pike or up the Pike, I feel like I'm looking down a
19 corridor of concrete and pavement and stone, the parking
20 lots, et cetera.

21 And my concern is, looking at the plan as it's now
22 proposed, that I feel that I'm still looking down a corridor
23 or a tunnel. And especially with the facades or the sides of
24 the buildings coming right up to the sidewalks, I feel like
25 you would be looking down a tunnel of rock and concrete and

1 brick, what-have-you. There is not enough open space. There
2 is the, the medians, but there is not enough open space for
3 green. So.

4 And I realize the way the plan is proposed, it's
5 going to offer Rockville much more housing, will broaden the
6 tax base. But what we're really looking at is uber in-fill,
7 or in-fill to the max. I don't know how else to say it. And
8 I'll finish up with, I'm repeating concerns that you've heard
9 this evening and before. And I'm not a traffic engineer.
10 But I think the way that the, on one hand which is good, the
11 way that the traffic is, or traffic lanes have been set up
12 with the cars and bikes and so on will definitely improve the
13 flow of traffic down Rockville Pike. And it's going to
14 result in more traffic than we already now have.

15 And lastly, as you've been hearing, I have no idea
16 where all the housing, all the kids that are going to come in
17 along Rockville Pike, where are we going to put them? My
18 daughter just turned 22, so she's out of the school system.
19 We have, last several years we have a brand new Richard
20 Montgomery, Beall Avenue. There isn't much room for us to
21 expand and so on. So I'll finish up here, and I thank you
22 very much for the opportunity to speak.

23 CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Next we have Mary Ann
24 Barnes, please.

25 MS. BARNES: Hi. I'm Mary Ann Barnes. And a good

1 evening to everyone. And I appreciate all the efforts that
2 many people have put into their specific areas. I was sort
3 of confused about which of these two groups to go onto, so I
4 think what I'd say would be the same actually in either one
5 of them. I live at 1204 Allison Drive. I've been there
6 since January 1966. I live in a \$14,200 house that's 804
7 square feet. I find Rockville Pike the way it is now very
8 convenient. And I hate to think about it changing.

9 I've studied the plan somewhat, but since I don't
10 have a paper copy of it, I am not as knowledgeable as I would
11 be. But I really think that the person or the people that
12 would really benefit from the plans are the developers. I'm
13 concerned about the safety factor, and the traffic is always,
14 is already over capacity and exceeds the limits. And I can't
15 imagine where they're going to put this boulevard in the
16 middle.

17 I started going to the Twinbrook planning meetings
18 when they first had them, and we went over to one of the
19 hotels they rented over on Rockville Pike. And I thought
20 that was a somewhat extravagant expense since the City has
21 facilities around. I couldn't believe that they were talking
22 about having these little play areas on the Pike that
23 children could go. And there was really no mention of
24 buffers or walls, or, to keep the traffic from coming up over
25 the curb and running over, you know, children who'd be

1 playing in those areas. That was just one of the things.
2 And also I'm kind of concerned about how many people can
3 carry, I'll say maybe three to seven days worth of food with
4 them in their hands and personal bags. And anyway, the bags
5 from the grocery stores are just not durable enough to carry.
6 They're going to drop a lot of it. If I have time, I'll go
7 through that.

8 Also, I guess what I'm really concerned, I am not a
9 mechanical engineer or architect. I've had a very
10 respectable profession. I work there today and I'm going to
11 work in the next two days in an honorable facility known as a
12 public school. I, incidentally, the classes now are very
13 small. I'm just amazed at how tiny they are. And it's
14 because of a lot of reasons that I'm not going to go into
15 right now. But I'm really concerned about, it is my
16 understanding that the most up-to-date fire trucks go up 100
17 feet ladders. Now, if you're starting to put up buildings
18 that have 14 story, and then a 16 story building, how on
19 earth are you going to access them? Who is going to be left
20 up -- help, help, come and get me? You know, who's going to
21 be up there at 100 feet?

22 I came up with a wonderful idea that might sound
23 absurd. And it was that the developers, if they're going to,
24 if they're going to have buildings that are going to go over
25 100 feet where they cannot put these wonderful ladders up,

1 that they may have to consider developing something like a
2 125-foot ladder or more. And then what they need to be, the
3 developers need to do, and this might sound absurd, but it
4 makes sense to me. They should be required to purchase and
5 maintain the level of the 9-1-1 fire ladder truck 24 hours a
6 day for at least a 99 year time duration lease.

7 CHAIRMAN: Okay.

8 MS. BARNES: Okay. We hear about that. I know
9 some of the schools in this county are on that.

10 CHAIRMAN: Ms. Barnes, you need to wrap up, please.

11 MS. BARNES: The budget should be required to pay
12 and maintain all the employment, these conditions, legally
13 recorded documents for all the motor apparatus and qualified
14 staffing.

15 CHAIRMAN: Ms. Barnes.

16 MS. BARNES: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.

17 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

18 MS. BARNES: I'm sorry. I'm not crazy, I just --

19 CHAIRMAN: No.

20 MS. BARNES: I don't want to go and visit anybody
21 that's going to be over 100 feet.

22 CHAIRMAN: I don't want to be over 100. I'd have a
23 hard time finding shoes.

24 MS. BARNES: And one other thing. (Indiscernible.)

25 CHAIRMAN: Okay.

1 MS. BARNES: On the rent (indiscernible).

2 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Next we have Jim Farrelly.

3 MR. FARRELLY: Good morning. Good evening. My
4 name is Jim Farrelly, and I live at 1109 Clagett Drive in the
5 Twinbrook section of Rockville. My wife, Anne Goodman, has
6 already testified on the new Rockville Pike Plan. My
7 comments would be in addition to hers.

8 During the first iteration of the plan, I commented
9 on a number of issues that I considered problematic. These
10 were, first, what local businesses we were going to lose upon
11 the implementation of the plan. Second, who is going to pay
12 for the plan? And third, who would financially benefit from
13 development along the Pike?

14 Tonight, I would like to comment on one issue, the
15 addition of parks to the area being developed. If the plan
16 is implemented, approximately 9,000 new residents and 4,500
17 new employees would be attracted into the planned area.
18 Currently, there are no parks, and there is very little
19 public open space in the plan area. The plan establishes a
20 goal of creating new public spaces but not necessarily parks.
21 See Page 435. The plan also states that creating parks has
22 long term benefits that are extremely important, but
23 sometimes more difficult to quantify than the returns from
24 development. Wow, is that a statement.

25 Perhaps the book Last Child in the Woods by Robert

1 Louv which discusses saving children from Nature Deficit
2 Disorder should be read by those hoping to develop along
3 Rockville Pike. The plan reads that the City should as a
4 start allocate resources through the capital improvements
5 program to purchase land for a neighborhood park
6 approximately one acre in size. As of now, parkland
7 acquisition is not funded by the City CIP, but future funding
8 could come from bonds, fee in lieu collected from developers,
9 as well as the state and the federal government. One would
10 hope that if a fee in lieu were used, they would be used
11 carefully since in the past as an example, fee in lieu would
12 either go straight to the general fund or be used to purchase
13 parkland within the city limits of Rockville but isolated
14 from the use of the people living in the Rockville Pike area.

15 The argument might be made that areas such as the
16 Plaza and Town Square could be considered a park or at least
17 a recreational area. It does have some recreational utility,
18 but it's not a park. At best, it can be considered a mixed
19 use recreational facility since the trees that have been
20 planted in the area do nothing but bring shade to the part of
21 the area occupied by the tables used by the surrounding
22 restaurants. A park should support wildlife and provide a
23 green space where children and their parents can play in the
24 dirt. Let's think seriously about bringing park areas to the
25 new and improved Rockville Pike. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN: Thank you, sir. Okay. That is everyone
2 who has signed up to speak. All right. Sir? Okay. And
3 please state your name and address for the record.

4 MR. COYLE: Thank you. Jim Coyle, 14 Fire Princess
5 Court. I submitted written testimony yesterday. I wanted to
6 come and offer a little different perspective tonight. And
7 that has to do with what's the purpose of Rockville's
8 economy? We're talking about more and more development, but
9 I don't think we've taken a step back to take a look at that
10 basic question. The purpose of Rockville's economy is to
11 provide revenue, services, and material goods for the
12 community so that a good quality of life can be achieved for
13 its residents, not for outside business.

14 Currently, Rockville meets or exceeds every
15 indicator of a successful local economy. Today our citizens
16 enjoy every conceivable personal, professional, and
17 recreational service, including liveable neighborhoods with
18 affordable housing, multi-faceted employment opportunities,
19 varied transportation services, broad-based consumer choices,
20 excellent educational facilities and programs, varied
21 recreation options, extensive neighborhood parks, and so on.
22 Importantly, numerically speaking there are two to three jobs
23 for every working-age resident of the City of Rockville right
24 now with projections of significant continued expansion even
25 if we don't make much of an effort. And it's an enviable

1 situation for most communities.

2 Other Rockville success indicators include a
3 positive business climate, excellent public services, a solid
4 and sustainable tax base, well-educated population, quality
5 educational systems, balanced land use, and a solid
6 residential base. On the negative side, the City is
7 increasingly under threat from excessive traffic and
8 congestion, pedestrian safety concerns, commercial
9 encroachment into existing neighborhoods, aging and needed
10 infrastructure, environmental challenges, and inflexible and
11 restrictive tax options, and varied other residual issues
12 facing a mature, built-out community.

13 For example, residential development is only 49
14 percent of the current land use, a potentially threatening
15 situation for maintaining our residential character. In
16 addition, businesses only contribute 38 percent of the City's
17 property taxes and due to state law, contribute zero sales
18 taxes to the City. Also, institutional uses, government and
19 non-profit, which consume an increasingly significant portion
20 of our tax land, 10 percent approximately, don't contribute
21 to our revenue base and account for major, unreimbursed costs
22 to the city. All of these adverse effects, if continued,
23 threaten Rockville's stability, capability, and residential
24 character.

25 I have a lot more to say, but I see I'm running out

1 of time. I'll be glad to submit this later. But I'd just
2 like to say that development for development's sake is a
3 Faustus bargain. And we're in the situation now, we're the
4 enviable, solid, residential community. And we have to be
5 very careful about the kinds of development we bring in the
6 future. They've got to be selective, and they've got to meet
7 the needs of the community. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you very much. Yes,
9 sir. Again, please state your name and address for the
10 record.

11 MR. BOWMAN: My name is Stewart Bowman. I have
12 lived for approximately 38 years at 707 West Montgomery
13 Avenue. And I'd just like to say a little bit, some of which
14 has already been said I'm sure, but a little bit about
15 traffic impact from the plan and green space impact.

16 If you drive up and down Rockville Pike, what you
17 see doesn't take a city planner to figure out. The Pike is
18 maxed out. And this plan will make traffic much worse. Why
19 else would the Pike Plan endorse weakening the current APFO
20 standards? Major intersections are already failing and in
21 gridlock at rush hour. Dense, 8 to 13-story, multi-use
22 buildings can only exacerbate the current congestion no
23 matter how many lanes are added.

24 I'm sure you notice that when additional lanes are
25 added to 270 or 495, they quickly become full. We are told

1 that dedicated bus lanes will significantly ease current and
2 future congestion. What seems obvious to me is that we will
3 have two under-utilized lanes on the Pike. Also, at this
4 point the BRT is unfunded and its future somewhat uncertain.
5 Major usage of the BRT defies the American experience. For
6 better or worse, we are a country built around the
7 automobile. Most people who own one will choose driving a
8 car over riding a bus. Most people cannot afford the time to
9 get from where they live to their jobs by riding the bus for
10 several hours a day. And even if they were to be fortunate
11 enough to live and work on a Metro rail line, Metro at this
12 point is unreliable and overcrowded. People will be driving.
13 That's a fact.

14 Now a little bit on green space issues. The
15 argument that we will experience a renaissance of green space
16 with the proposed plan is simply a mirage. The inclusion of
17 green roofs and so-called pocket parks will benefit very few
18 people. A few curbside trees will do little to soften the
19 appearance and feel of Rockville Pike or increase the quality
20 of the pedestrian experience. There is no provision for
21 adequate building setback to provide an inviting and
22 continuous visual experience for pedestrians or drivers. It
23 is commonly accepted in urban planning that sufficient
24 setback for green space between major streets and tall
25 buildings is essential for human scale experience. As a

1 residential building contractor, I can easily understand why
2 large developers are chomping at the bit to build high-
3 density apartment projects. The more stories of residential
4 one builds and the higher the density, the greater profit
5 maker. As a resident, I see the Pike Plan will benefit
6 developers, but as a Rockville citizen, not so much.

7 I have lived in Rockville since 1975, long enough
8 to see the shocking results of the 1960s urban renewal in
9 downtown Rockville. Those mistakes took almost 40 years to
10 unwind. The changes proposed by the Rockville Pike Plan will
11 be irrevocable. Thank you for your time.

12 CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Is there anyone
13 else? Anyone else wishes to speak? Ma'am. Again, please
14 state your name and address for the record.

15 MS. MULLICAN: Brigitta Mullican. I live on Lewis
16 Avenue.

17 CHAIRMAN: Didn't you speak --

18 MS. MULLICAN: Not tonight.

19 CHAIRMAN: -- on the first night?

20 MS. MULLICAN: Am I not allowed to speak tonight?

21 CHAIRMAN: It's one testimony per person during the
22 hearing.

23 MS. MULLICAN: I'm not allowed to speak tonight? I
24 did speak once before.

25 CHAIRMAN: Yes. The rules are --

1 MS. MULLICAN: It's another rule?

2 CHAIRMAN: Yes. That's what the --

3 MS. MULLICAN: Okay. Well, then, I'll submit my
4 comments, my additional comments in writing.

5 CHAIRMAN: We appreciate that.

6 MS. MULLICAN: Am I allowed to speak at the Zoning?

7 CHAIRMAN: Yes.

8 MS. MULLICAN: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anyone else?

10 MS. GINSBURG: Good evening. My name is Christina
11 Ginsburg, and I live at 1204 Simmons Drive, Rockville, 20851.
12 I will be speaking tonight as the president of the Citizens
13 Association. Frankly, I think what I have to say to you
14 tonight will be no surprise. I will start by endorsing
15 nearly all of what the West End Citizens Association has
16 presented. In particular, I have not verified Ms. McMullen's
17 calculations about possible population density, but I do
18 believe she is substantially correct that the situation she
19 describes could occur under blank check mixed use Zoning. I
20 will continue by addressing some, by no means all of the
21 general problems with this plan and this process.

22 This plan is so sub-par that the City should be
23 ashamed of wasting \$530,000 of the taxpayers' money in direct
24 consultants' fees, and another unspecified amount of salary
25 and benefits on two years of additional staff time. The

1 thing that leaps out in comparing this plan to the
2 consultant's version, as well as to other city neighborhood
3 plans is how well it has been whitewashed, or green-washed,
4 as you wish, by removing information that would present a
5 complete and accurate analysis that is transparent to the
6 public.

7 We can start with the front pages. The
8 consultant's version had a list of who participated without
9 attribution as to who they were representing. On
10 examination, it was evident that developers, developers'
11 employees, and other persons in the development industry from
12 as far away as Baltimore were attending the (indiscernible)
13 without revealing their affiliations. That list needs to go
14 back in so it is on the record that the citizens were not the
15 only people in the room. For the record, my name was on that
16 document, and I certainly did not endorse what was in it.

17 Moving on, the current document lists outreach as
18 if all the citizens organizations contacted were approving.
19 That is certainly false for several of the citizens
20 organizations before you tonight, and it is clear that the
21 staff who made these presentations carried back few of our
22 concerns to you. You cannot equate outreach with approval or
23 even participation with approval. That is disingenuous. I
24 would bet if you went back to those citizens associations who
25 were treated to the staff's presentations, that they did not

1 approve. And certainly individuals in the meetings I
2 attended did not approve.

3 The current plan removes several sections that were
4 of concern. Where are the pages relating to the cost of
5 implementation and the tax return? We estimate that
6 Rockville may net as little as 1 million per year in extra
7 tax revenue. You heard Mr. Whalen say that, in a previous,
8 on a previous night, that it will take 50 million to 75
9 million just to buy the right of ways fronting the commercial
10 properties. Even if you take them by eminent domain, they
11 must be paid for. Where are the costs for laying new roads
12 and BRT tracks? Where is a real analysis of traffic impacts?
13 You heard truth from Mr. El-Shafi (phonetic sp.) that you can
14 rename things as much as you want, but a failing intersection
15 is still a failing intersection. If it walks like a duck and
16 quacks like a duck, it's a duck. Why is that not
17 acknowledged?

18 You know perfectly well from the Duball application
19 that Duball's two towers will gridlock Town Center. So why
20 do you think that what is planned here will have no effect on
21 Rockville Pike? Again, we heard truth from Eric Segal and
22 Sue Lee Cho during the APFO review that cars will have to
23 detour off the Pike at Montrose to bypass Rockville on 270
24 after the Pike gridlocks from excessive development.

25 And a third pointer to this truth. This plan

1 before you tonight sites major traffic impact coming from the
2 mixed use development at Pike and Rose, and White Flint south
3 of Randolph, yet it acts as if there will be no traffic
4 problems caused by mixed use development north of Randolph.
5 Where is the study that I have asked for many times as to how
6 tall each building on the Pike can be if all parcels were
7 built out? Right now what you have is the JBG deadlock,
8 where a developer like JBG can be approved for 16-story
9 buildings that suck up all the APFO capacity and leave
10 smaller property owners with worthless parcels.

11 You're clearly aiming for the solution. Scrap the
12 APFO and let everyone build 16 stories. How about we keep
13 the APFO and everyone can build 5 stories or whatever is
14 sustainable? The BRT is another whitewash, green-wash, red
15 herring, whatever you want to call it. Here is the article
16 referencing the report from the Institute for Transportation
17 and Development Policy. At the best, BRT may run between
18 Rockville Metro and Bethesda Metro. If it does that, it will
19 not serve the Rockville Pike Plan area because to be bus
20 rapid transit, it will have limited stops or no stops. If
21 you add stops along Rockville Pike, it is no longer rapid.
22 What it is, then, is a gold-plated, outrageously expensive
23 bus. So says the Montgomery County Civic Federation and the
24 Action Committee for Transit which is saying to focus on
25 running actual buses and building out Metro.

1 I don't need to repeat their points, but part of
2 your due diligence should be reading their reports. And you
3 should not predicate increasing density on the Pike on
4 getting funding for the BRT when we can all look at King Farm
5 and see that the Corridor Cities Transitway is still not
6 funded and may never be. Furthermore, bike lanes and other
7 amenities should not come with the price tag of a big, big
8 building attached. Can't we build bike lanes and put in bike
9 lockers without adding more buildings and unsustainable
10 density? Can't we fix roads and curbs with current taxes?

11 CHAIRMAN: Okay.

12 MS. GINSBURG: People don't even understand that
13 Rockville's current citizens are already footing the bill,
14 and it's a big bill.

15 CHAIRMAN: Ms. Ginsburg, your time is up.

16 MS. GINSBURG: I'll finish this paragraph, sir.
17 The City's own documents show that developers sit in non-
18 public planning meetings, not DRC meetings, with staff from
19 various departments, and discuss their ideas of coming
20 density and get on the public dime the water infrastructure
21 laid in advance. As long as it's done in advance, developers
22 pay pennies on the dollar and maybe even nothing for
23 connecting to an existing water system, while the cost is
24 paid by the city issuing bonds that are paid for by the
25 current residents' taxes.

1 CHAIRMAN: Okay, Ms. Ginsburg, you're more than a
2 minute over your time.

3 MS. GINSBURG: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

5 MS. GINSBURG: I'll continue later.

6 CHAIRMAN: You may submit it in writing. Is there
7 anyone else who wishes to speak? Please. Okay. And please
8 state your name and address for the record.

9 MS. MILLER: I'm Judy Miller, 5920 Halpine Road.
10 Many excellent, excellent points have been made about how
11 deficient and wrong the Pike Plan is. I continue to be
12 amazed. The revised plan put together by Planning Staff and
13 generated by a half a million dollars of consultant fees,
14 read to the citizen group reads like a marketing tool for
15 developers. It's half-baked and half-done, a grandiose
16 delusion without any foundation or financing. In fact, it's
17 superior, preachy, pronouncements telling citizens what they
18 want and need would be comical if it wasn't being imposed on
19 our community.

20 Let's talk about transportation. The preposterous
21 idea that we can turn the Pike into some sort of walking
22 paradise with convenient mass transit options to get
23 everywhere. First of all, let me tell you, I walk and I use
24 mass transit. I walk up and down the Pike. I walk across
25 the Pike to doctors, groceries, clothing, and household

1 stores. It couldn't get much better with the variety. The
2 Pike is a major thoroughfare with thousands of people using
3 it to get around and to work. Metro is crammed now, and BRT
4 is an expensive, unfunded, redundant bus service. The grand
5 boulevard with all the divisions and medians and the BRT
6 barreling down it in the middle, and the local lanes with the
7 cars trying to park, and the excess roads, this strikes me as
8 particularly unsafe. The plan says that the access roads
9 break down the scale of the formidable width of the
10 boulevard, allowing pedestrians to cross in two or three
11 stages, with the medians to provide refuge for the
12 pedestrians crossing the Pike. Refuge?

13 The plan, with its over ten lanes, and its cut-up,
14 confusing traffic serves to cut off the Twinbrook Metro from
15 the other side of the Pike. No more getting across the Pike
16 in 30 seconds when you're coming home from work. Many people
17 have testified that they want to maintain the current, rich
18 variety of services and shops with easy auto access and
19 parking on the Pike. We don't want to go walking down the
20 Pike with a TV on our back. The plan says that people feel
21 unsafe walking across a surface parking garage and prefer a
22 garage to surface parking. Really?

23 Similarly, the plan says it is important for those
24 buildings to frame the street and provide a comfortable sense
25 of spatial enclosure. More like being in an overcrowded,

1 concrete high-rise grand canyon. From my townhouse, I'm
2 surrounded by two ugly, oppressive, concrete parking garages,
3 one an unusable fortress overwhelming and overshadowing our
4 neighborhood. Boondoggle garages with foundation and
5 structural problems show the reality of unregulated,
6 unbridled development.

7 The Pike similarly has no foundation and no
8 financing and lacks a basis in reality. It is just one of
9 the worst cookie-cutter, development-friendly plans in the
10 county. It is based on bad concepts and phony ideas and
11 needs to be redone. The citizens deserve better. But I do
12 thank you for your work.

13 CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Is there anyone else?
14 Going once. Going twice. Going three times. All right,
15 then I will close the public hearing on Rockville's Pike Plan
16 draft, and we'll take a five minute break and come back and
17 continue the hearing on the suggested zoning changes. So
18 thank you very much. We are temporarily adjourned.

19 (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded.)
20
21
22
23
24
25

DIGITALLY SIGNED CERTIFICATE

DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that the attached pages represent an accurate transcript of the electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the City of Rockville's Planning Board in the matter of:

ROCKVILLE PIKE PLAN

Meeting 10-2013



By: _____

Date: May 29, 2013

Mary Rettig, Transcriber